IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 6327 of 1998

Between:

S.K. Rizwan, S/o. S.K.Mohammed, R/o.27/1608,

Jyothinagar, Nellore.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. A.P.State Housing Corporation Ltd.,

Rep.by its Managing Director, Himayathnagar,

Hyderabad.

2. The District Manager,

A.P.State Housing Corporation,

Vedaipalem, Nellore.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction especially one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring that the action of the respondents in not adhearing the Section 23(h) of the Industrial Dispute Act while making appointments after the petitioner was terminated and not disposing of his representation dt. October, 1996 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Arts.14 & 16 of the Constitution of India.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.M.SURENDER RAO

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.V.CH.NAIDU

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed seeking a Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not adhering to the Section 25-H of Industrial Disputes Act while re-employing similarly placed persons after their termination and also not disposing of the representation filed by the petitioner in the month of October, 1996 as arbitrary and illegal.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that at the time of admission of the Writ Petition, an interim direction was granted on 11-03-1998 in W.P.M.P.No.7727/1998 to consider the representation filed by the petitioner. Now, it is more than six years since the interim order was passed. The learned Counsel is not able to ascertain the position as on today. He only requests the Court to direct the respondents to consider the said application purported to have been filed in the month of October, 1996 by the petitioner for considering his case for being re-employed as per the provisions of section 25-H of Industrial Disputes Act, if not already considered. In view of the above, the respondents are directed to consider the representation purported to have been made by the petitioner in the month of October, 1996, if not already considered, pursuant to the interim orders passed by this court earlier as expeditiously as possible.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

_____

27-07-2004.

To

1. A.P.State Housing Corporation Ltd.,

Rep.by its Managing Director, Himayathnagar,

Hyderabad.

2. The District Manager,

A.P.State Housing Corporation,

Vedaipalem, Nellore.

3. Two CD copies.

RNS/VS